UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/266,675	03/11/99	KIMMERLY R	777.278US1

TM02/0705

STEVEN J ROCCI
WOODCOCK WASHBURN KURTZ MACKIEWICZ & NOR
ONE LIBERTY PLACE
46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA PA 19103

EXAMINER	
LY,A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2172	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/266,675	KIMMERLY, RANDY S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2172	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16)☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
18)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
19)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-24 are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 B1 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 6,061,743 issued to Thatcher et al. (hereinafter as Thatcher).

With respect to claim 1, Meyer discloses a method of generating a cache of information relating to the classes, requesting a search of the class path, and searching the cache to satisfy the requested search as claimed (col. 7, lines 58-67, col. 8, lines 1-4, col. 11, lines 50-67, and col. 12, lines 1-46).

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "class files databases, the classes in the class path."

However, Thatcher disclose class files database, the classes in the class path as claimed (col. 8, lines 24-67, and col. 9, lines 1-13 and lines 29-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Thatcher so as to have a method of locating classes in a class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

Claim 2 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method ('743 of col. 8, lines 24-67, and col. 9, lines 1-13, and lines 29-67; '856 of col. 7, lines 58-67, col. 8, lines 1-4, col. 11, lines 50-67, and col. 12, lines 1-46), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

4. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 B1 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 6,061,743 issued to Thatcher et al. (hereinafter as Thatcher) and further in view of US Patent No 6,078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury).

With respect to claim 3, Meyer in view of Thatcher discloses a method for locating classes in a class path as discussed in claim 1.

Meyer in view of Thatcher does not disclose explicitly indicate "the class path comprises multiple elements, each element having multiple classes stored therein."

However, Ainsbury discloses multiple elements as claimed (col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 13, lines 10-31, col. 21, lines 39-52, and col. 22, lines 46-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer in view of Thatcher with the teachings of Ainsbury so as to have a class path that comprises multiple elements, and each element has multiple classes stored in it because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 4, Meyer in view of Thatcher discloses a ZIP files as claimed ('743 of col. 9, lines 14-67).

5. Claims 5-6, 15-16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 B1 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 6,078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury).

With respect to claim 5, Meyer discloses the class path, wherein at least one of the elements has cache of information sufficient to satisfy the request for that element as claimed (col. 7, lines 58-67, col. 8, lines 1-4, col. 11, lines 50-67, and col. 12, lines 1-46).

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "generating a search request for desired classes within the multi-element."

However, Ainsbury discloses multiple elements as claimed (col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 13, lines 10-31, col. 21, lines 39-52, and col. 22, lines 46-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Ainsbury so as to have a method of locating classes in multi-element class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

Claim 6 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method ('856 of col. 7, lines 58-67, col. 8, lines 1-4, col. 11, lines 50-67, and col. 12, lines 1-46; '924 of col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 13, lines 10-31, col. 21, lines 39-52, and col. 22, lines 46-52), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 15, Meyer discloses the wrapper associated with each element to invoke element specific search methods as claimed (col. 19, lines 35-67, and col. 20, lines 1-29).

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "means for receiving requests to search a multi-element class path."

However, Ainsbury discloses multiple elements as claimed (col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 13, lines 10-31, col. 21, lines 39-52, and col. 22, lines 46-52).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Ainsbury so as to have a class path manager that comprises means for receiving requests to search and means for transferring such requests because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 16, Meyer discloses the element specific search method comprising searching a cache associated with such element as claimed (col. 23, lines 15-61, and col. 27, lines 5-50).

Claim 23 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a computer readable medium rather than a method ('856 of col. 7, lines 58-67, col. 8, lines 1-4, col. 11, lines 50-67, and col. 12, lines 1-46; '924 of col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 13, lines 10-31, col. 21, lines 39-52, and col. 22, lines 46-52), and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

6. Claims 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 B1 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US

Patent No. 6,078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury), and further in view of US Patent No. 6,061,743 issued to Thatcher et al. (hereinafter as Thatcher).

With respect to claim 7, Meyer in view of Ainsbury discloses a method of locating classes in a multiple element class path as discussed in claim 5.

Meyer in view of Ainsbury does not disclose explicitly indicate "at least one of the elements comprises a Zip file."

However, Thatcher discloses the Zip file as claimed (col. 9, lines 14-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer in view of Ainsbury with the teachings of Thatcher so as to have at least one of the elements that comprises a Zip file because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 8, Meyer in view of Ainsbury discloses a method of locating classes in a multiple element class path as discussed in claim 5.

Meyer in view of Ainsbury does not disclose explicitly indicate "the classes comprises Java classes."

However, Thatcher discloses the Java classes as claimed (col. 9, lines 42-67, and col. 10, lines 1-19, and lines 6-21).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer in view of Ainsbury

with the teachings of Thatcher so as to have the classes comprising Java classes because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

7. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 B1 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 6,078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury), and further in view of US Patent No. 6,237,135 issued to Timbol.

With respect to claim 9, Meyer in view of Ainsbury discloses a method of locating classes in a multiple element class path as discussed in claim 5.

Meyer in view of Ainsbury does not disclose explicitly indicate "at least one of the elements comprises a Java package manager."

However, Timbol discloses the Java package manager as claimed (col. 21, lines 10-67, and col. 22, lines 1-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer in view of Ainsbury with the teachings of Timbol so as to have at least one of the elements that comprises a Java package manager because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or

class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

8. Claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 4,484,267 issued to Fletcher.

With respect to claim 10, Meyer discloses the parsing the class path as claimed (col. 13, lines 5-20, and col. 19, lines 45-62).

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "a method of determining which elements are viable for catching and initiating creation of caches for those elements which are viable."

However, Fletcher discloses a method of determining which elements are viable for catching and initiating creation of catches for those elements which are viable as claimed (col. 1, lines 35-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 11, Meyer discloses a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path as discussed in claim 10.

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "the viability of an element for caching is dependent on the ease of tracking which elements have had changes in them."

However, Fletcher discloses the viability of an element for catching is dependent on the ease of tracking which elements have had changes in them as claimed (col. 1, lines 35-67, col. 2, lines 39-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 12, Meyer discloses a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path as discussed in claim 10.

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "the viability of an element for caching is determined based on it being a predetermined type."

However, Fletcher discloses the viability of an element for catching is determined based on it being a predetermined type as claimed (col. 2, lines 39-67, and col. 7, lines 1-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 13, Meyer discloses a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path as discussed in claim 10.

Meyer does not disclose explicitly indicate "checking a registry to see if the element already has a cache associated with it."

However, Fletcher discloses the checking registry to see if the element already has a cache associated with it as claimed (col. 11, lines 34-67, and col. 12, lines 1-5).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

9. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 4,484,267 issued to Fletcher, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,199,082 issued to Ferrel et al. (hereinafter as Ferrel).

With respect to claim 14, Meyer in view of Fletcher discloses a method of creating caches for selected elements of a class path as discussed in claim 10.

Meyer in view of Fletcher does not disclose explicitly indicate "an existing cache is up to date."

However, Ferrel discloses the existing cache as claimed (col. 9, lines 50-67, and col. 47, lines 12-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer in view of Fletcher with the teachings of Ferrel so as to have an existing cache that is up to date because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

10. Claims 17-18, and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,1078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury) in view of US Patent No. 6,243,856 issued to 4,484,267 issued to Fletcher.

With respect to claim 17, Ainsbury discloses classes, multiple elements, and wrappers as claimed (col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 3, lines 53-67, col. 4, lines 1-3, col. 10, lines 1-14, col. 21, lines 39-52).

Ainsbury does not disclose explicitly indicate "viable cache, creating a cache for such viable."

However, Fletcher discloses the viable cache as claimed (see abstract, col. 2, lines 39-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 7, lines 1-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ainsbury with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have means for parsing multi-element class path and each element is a viable cache because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

With respect to claim 18, Fletcher discloses the cache for each viable candidate that comprising a name of the class as claimed (col. 8, lines 5-34).

With respect to claim 20, Fletcher discloses the directories are not cached as claimed (col. 10, lines 27-59).

With respect to claim 21, Fletcher discloses the viability of an element for caching is dependent on the ease of tracking which elements have had changes in them as claimed (see abstract, col. 2, lines 39-67, and col. 6, lines 4-67).

With respect to claim 22, Ainsbury discloses classes, multiple elements, and wrappers as claimed (col. 2, lines 17-33, col. 3, lines 53-67, col. 4, lines 1-3, col. 10, lines 1-14, col. 21, lines 39-52).

Ainsbury does not disclose explicitly indicate "viable cache, creating a cache for such viable."

However, Fletcher discloses the viable cache as claimed (see abstract, col. 2, lines 39-67, col. 6, lines 4-67, and col. 7, lines 1-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ainsbury with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have a system for finding classes in a multi-element class path because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

11. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,1078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury) in view of US Patent No. 6,243,856 issued to 4,484,267 issued to Fletcher, and further in view of US Patent No. 6,016,743 issued to Thatcher et al. (hereinafter as Thatcher).

With respect to claim 19, Ainsbury in view of Fletcher means for parsing the multi-element class path as discussed in claim 17.

Ainsbury in view of Fletcher does not disclose explicitly indicate "the group consisting of ZIP files."

However, Thatcher discloses the ZIP files as claimed (col. 9, lines 14-67, and col. 10, lines 1-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Ainsbury in view of Fletcher with the teachings of Thatcher so as to have ZIP files because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

12. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,243,856 B1 issued to Meyer et al. (hereinafter as Meyer) in view of US Patent No. 6,078,924 issued to Ainsbury et al. (hereinafter as Ainsbury) and further in view of US Patent No. 6,199,082 issued to Ferrel et al. (hereinafter as Ferrel).

With respect to claim 23, Meyer in view of Ainsbury discloses a computer readable medium having instructions stored for causing a computer to perform a method of locating classes in a multi-element class path as discussed in claim 23.

Meyer in view of Ainsbury does not disclose explicitly indicate "a date/time stamp on the element having the cache of information to determine if the cache is up to date."

However, Ferrel discloses the date/time stamp as claimed (col. 9, lines 50-67, and col. 47, lines 12-40).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Meyer in view of Ainsbury with the teachings of Fletcher so as to have a date/time stamp to check the element having the cache of information because the combination would provide a method that is easy and fast find to locate the classes of an application within a predetermined directory or class path in the system especially in the development of projects being written in object-oriented programming language environment.

Conclusions

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosures.

Walsh (US Patent No. 6,233,601 B1)

Sonderegger (US Patent No. 5,893,118)

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Anh Ly whose telephone number is (703) 306-4527. The examiner can be reached on Monday – Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, see the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu, can be reached on (703) 305-4393.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051 (for formal communications intended for entry)

or:

(703) 305-9724 or (703) 308-6606 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (receptionist).

Inquiries of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

AL

June 21th, 2001

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100